

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/673,156	Applicant(s) DOBBINS ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael E. Keefer	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 9-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 9-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment and RCE filed 10/31/2007.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 appears to be missing text in line 13, the examiner will assume that applicant intended the amended portion of claim 1 to read as the similar amended portion of claim 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear what is meant by "wherein remaining machine readable content tag includes remaining ... electronic and data encoded". It is unclear how the content tag could not remain electronic, and it is unclear what the term "data encoded" means.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent

granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-18, and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moskowitz (US 20030200439).

Regarding **claims 2 and 21**, Moskowitz discloses:

A method of coupling a content tag with content, the method comprising:
associating the content tag indicating a type of service in accordance with the content, wherein the content tag is created and associated with the content at the point of origination of one selected from a group consisting of a client and a server; ([0030] discloses associating a watermark with a stream of data)

reading the content tag in an instance of peer-to-peer network transmission to determine whether at least part of the content should be accorded preferred transmission service; generating flow information for the content, the flow information including information specifying the type of service indicated in the content tag; ([0044] disclose reading the watermark and giving QoS to the flow)

transmitting at least part of the content according to the type of service specified by the flow information over a peer-to-peer network, wherein if the content tag indicates that at least part of the content should be accorded preferred transmission service, and if the content tag does not indicate that at least part of the content should be accorded preferred transmission service, transmitting the content with a standard type of service; and providing the at least

part of the content to a user requested location. (it is inherent that the packet will be forwarded onto its destination with standard service. See [0044].)

Regarding **claim 3 as applied to claim 2**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein the content is electronic data. ([0030] discloses a stream of data)

Regarding **claims 4 and 23 as applied to claims 2 and 21**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein the content is media content. ([0030] discloses a stream of data, [0007] discloses Napster, which is used for exchanging media content.)

Regarding **claim 5 as applied to claim 2**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein the flow information for the content is generated at the location where the content is originally published or where the content is originally transmitted. ([0030] discloses this takes place at the place of transmission)

Regarding **claims 7 and 24 as applied to claims 2 and 23**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein the content tag enables control on distribution of the content by at least one selected from a group consisting of an owner of the content, a peer-to-peer network, and a service provider. ([0044] allows each router (i.e. network service provider) to control the distribution of the content (i.e. the path etc) on its network.)

Regarding **claim 8 as applied to claim 2**, Moskowitz discloses:

identifying a type of content in order to provide specific transport service to differing types of content. ([0034] discloses that the watermark indicates a QoS

type for the content, "in order to provide..." is an intended use limitation which is not being given patentable weight.)

Regarding **claim 9 as applied to claims 2 and 8**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein identifying a type of content includes: reading the content tag.

([0044] discloses reading the watermark)

Regarding **claims 10 and 11 as applied to claims 2 and 8**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein the specific transport service includes at least one selected from a group consisting of a predetermined amount of bandwidth, a quality of service, a transmission attribute, an amount of packet loss, and an amount of jitter. ([0044] discloses reliability and latency, among other transmission attributes. Additionally [0050] discloses bandwidth levels.)

Regarding **claim 12 as applied to claim 2**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein associating the content tag with the content includes: associating a multi-element content tag with the content. (see [0036]-[0042] as well as [0031])

Regarding **claim 13 as applied to claim 2**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein associating the content tag with the content includes: associating a content tag, wherein the content tag is configured such that the content tag is extendible while remaining machine readable. (the content tag may vary in size, and is always machine readable. See [0030] "the size of the watermark may vary")

Regarding **claim 14 as applied to claims 2 and 13**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein remaining machine readable content tag includes remaining at least one selected from a group consisting of electronic and data encoded.

([0030] discloses that the content tag has electronic and data in it.)

Regarding **claim 15 as applied to claim 2**, Moskowitz discloses:

authenticating the distribution allowed for the content, and authorizing only the allowed distribution for the content. ([0045] discloses checking that the content is authentic)

Regarding **claims 17 and 25 as applied to claims 2 and 21**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein the user requested location is a device. ([0044] discloses at least sending the content to another router, if not sending it to a final destination)

Regarding **claims 18 and 26 as applied to claims 2, 17, 21, and 25**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein the device is one selected from a group consisting of personal computer, a minicomputer, a microcomputer, a mainframe computer, a personal digital assistant, a hand-held device, a set-top box, a cellular telephone, an IP telephone, a videophone, a videogame machine, a television, and a personal video recorder. ([0007] discloses napster, which is used to send content from a PC to a PC)

Regarding **claim 20 as applied to claim 2**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein the content tag includes electronic bits of information identifying at least one selected from a group consisting of a type of service, a content class or type, an originator of the content, metadata with searchable descriptors, an authentication Uniform Resource Locator (URL) configured to enable dynamic authentication, an association with a type of network service, and a content application. ([0034] a type of service is disclosed)

Regarding **claim 22 as applied to claim 21**, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein transmitting the at least part of the electronic data includes: transmitting the electronic data over a network in which clients and servers are distributed such that an owner of the electronic data does not own the server element on which the electronic data is stored. ([0044], it is clear that the transmitter of the data does not own the routers which the data is transmitted over, nor does the transmitter own the destination of the content.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 16 and 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moskowitz as applied to claims 2 and 15 above, and further in view of Jennings et al. (US 2002/0099842), hereafter Jennings.

Regarding claim 19, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein generating the flow information for the content further comprises:
retrieving a transport profile corresponding to the content tag from at least one selected from a group consisting of an external database, a look up table, and a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) serving agent. ([0045] discloses comparing the watermark with a table of known watermarks to determine the authenticity of the watermark, therefore deciding whether to transport the data or not.)

Moskowitz discloses all the limitations of claims 16 and 19 except for including geographic restrictions.

The general concept of using geographic restrictions to limit content distribution is well known in the art as taught by Jennings. (See [0137]-[0139])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Moskowitz with the general concept of using geographic restrictions to limit content distribution as taught by Jennings in order to enable the content owner to control who views its content with more granularity. (Jennings [0039])

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael E. Keefer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9am-5pm.

Application/Control Number:
10/673,156
Art Unit: 2154

Page 9

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

~~Supervisor~~
NATHAN FLYNN
PATENT EXAMINER

MEK 2/1/2008